

### **REMARKS**

Applicant has carefully reviewed and considered the Office Action mailed on February 21, 2008, and the references cited therewith.

Claims 1-30 are now pending in this application.

#### **§ 102 Rejection of the Claims**

Claims 1-30 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Eichstadt et al. (U.S.Publication No. 2003/0023754).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1-30 as follows:

Eichstadt describes a method and system for adding real-time, interactive functionality to a web-page that enables interaction between and among a plurality of users viewing the same web-page. Further, Eichstadt in paragraph [0010] describes the server component of the software that incorporates script code into the requested web-page before that web-page is transmitted by the server to the client computer. The script code comprises the client component of the software and will add functionality to the web-page. Furthermore, in paragraph [0013], Eichstadt describes that the script code accounts and compensates for the computer hardware differences of the various users so that any changes made to a web-page by one user appear in the same place on the web-page for all users viewing the web-page in the same session. In contrast, independent claims 1, 9, 17, 22, 26 and 29 recite a method and system that uses similar functionalities of different components within a software application when executing the application and application components. Further, the independent claims 1, 9, 17, 22, 26 and 29 recite a client that requests a specific component from a server so that the user can run the component. The server then sends only the parameter information about the component to the client. The user then receives this information at the client and links it to the corresponding predefined structure to provide a script specific predefined structure, and the client then executes the script specific predefined structure. Support for this can be found in page 5, lines 10-15 & 22-26 and in claims 1, 9, 17, 22, 26 and 29.

Claims 2-8, 10-16, 18-21, 23-25, 27-28 and 30 depend directly or indirectly from independent claims 1, 9, 17, 22, 26 and 29, respectively, so they should be also found allowable for the reason presented above.

For the above reasons, claims 1-30 should be found allowable over Eichstadt et al. and Applicant requests that the rejection of claims 1-30 as anticipated by Eichstadt et al. should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims 1-30 are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney (603-888-7958) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

MURALIDHARAN LAKSHMINARASIMHAN KANCHI

By their Representatives,

Global IP Services, PLLC,  
198 F, 27<sup>th</sup> Cross, 3<sup>rd</sup> Block,  
Jayanagar, Bangalore 560 011  
INDIA

Phone: 603-888-7958



Date: May 19, 2008

By \_\_\_\_\_  
Prakash Nama  
Reg. No. 44,255